

D651

.E3 E3

THE EGYPTIAN QUESTION

Napoleon said to the Governor of St. Helena: "Egypt is the most important country in the world."—Rose's Life of Napoleon, Vol. 1, page 356.

Egyptian Delegation
The Shoreham
Washington, D. C.

October, 1919

D. of S.
NOV 20 1913

21

11651
E3E3

SHALL RIGHT OR MIGHT PREVAIL?

Egypt is a country of immense wealth. It has millions of acres of agricultural land greater in value per acre and in producing power than any other country in the world. The seizure of Egypt by Great Britain adds to Britain's enormous possessions an area of 350,000 square miles and a population of 13,000,000 people. The value of the natural resources so seized is beyond computation.

Egypt is one compact whole—one nation—one language. The character of the people, their conduct, their habits, their sympathies and their inclinations are the same throughout that country. Because of geographic situation, however, Egypt has attracted the avarice of colonizing powers more, perhaps, than any other country in the world. In 1798 the French under Napoleon invaded Egypt. In 1801 the French were expelled from Egypt. In 1807 Great Britain attempted to invade Egypt but was ejected by the Egyptian Army.

Egypt continued to be a Turkish province until 1831 when war broke out between Egypt and Turkey, and the Egyptian Army was victorious. Constantinople would have fallen to the Egyptians, but Great Britain and France interfered in order to preserve the balance of power, and the Egyptians were compelled to give up the full fruits of their victories.

By the Treaty of London of 1840-1841, Egypt became autonomous, subject only to an annual tribute to Turkey of about \$3,500,000. The government of Egypt could maintain an army, contract loans, make commercial treaties and enter into international agreements. For all practical purposes, Egypt was independent and free.

In 1882, Great Britain occupied Egypt ostensibly to protect the Khedive against the movement for popular government and continued to occupy the country, against the protest of the Egyptians, under the pretext of protecting the people from the Khedive.

The British Government from the time of occupation up to the beginning of the recent war promised to withdraw the British troops from Egypt. Gladstone, when Prime Minister, said "if one pledge can be more solemn and sacred than another, special sacredness in this case binds us to withdraw the British troops from Egypt."

Lord Salisbury, when Prime Minister in 1889, solemnly assured Egypt and the world that Egypt would never be placed under a British "protectorate" or annexed by Great Britain.

Great Britain had agreed by the Treaty of London of 1840-41 to protect the autonomy of Egypt and in the Anglo-French agreement of April 8, 1904, Great Britain declared that it had no intention of altering the political status of Egypt.

After the beginning of the war and on December 18, 1914, Great Britain deposed the Khedive and appointed a Sultan of her own choosing to the throne of Egypt. On the same date Great Britain proclaimed the so-called protectorate over Egypt announcing, however, at the same time that it was merely for the period of the war and only a step towards the independence of Egypt.

King George in a letter which was widely circulated throughout Egypt and which was published in the London Times of December 21, 1914, said:

" * * * I feel convinced that you will be able, with the cooperation of your Ministers and

the protection of Great Britain, to overcome all influences which are seeking to destroy *the independence of Egypt*, * * *”

This change of status being announced at the time as a merely temporary war measure, was assumed by the Egyptians to be such. The Egyptians with absolute unanimity, took sides with the Allies and served to make, as they believed, the world safe for democracy and for the right of national self-determination in all peoples.

When the Armistice was signed, the Egyptians rejoiced in the thought that the day of their deliverance had come, and that henceforth they would enjoy that right of national self-determination proclaimed by President Wilson. A commission was appointed by the Egyptian people to attend the Peace Conference, where their independence and sovereignty could be consecrated and acknowledged by the Powers.

In violation of its pledges of independence to the Egyptian people, and regardless of the fact that the Egyptian people had served and sacrificed in the Allied cause, Great Britain arrested four of the leading citizens of Egypt, who had been selected by the Egyptian people to go to Paris, and these four were torn from their homes without warning and deported to Malta where they were thrown into a military prison.

When the Egyptian people learned of this act of perfidy on the part of Great Britain, their indignation was intense. National self-determination demonstrations were held throughout Egypt. Great Britain answered these demonstrations for national self-determination, the principle for which Great Britain had ostensibly fought in the war, by firing machine guns

into crowds of these peaceable and unarmed, liberty-seeking people, killing more than a thousand and wounding vastly more.

Egyptians who dared to assert in public that Egypt should have the right of national self-determination were put in prison. The cry for liberty by an Egyptian was answered by British military punishment.

If present conditions are permitted to continue, liberty is dead to Egypt, and the right of self-determination to all peoples, for which Americans believed they were fighting, has been made a hollow mockery.

General Allenby finally, by force of Egyptian public opinion, advised the British Government to permit the Commission to proceed to Paris. When the Commission reached Paris, they asked for a hearing before the Peace Conference. This was denied them. They wrote to President Wilson and asked for a conference with him. Their appeals were in vain.

Some days after the Commission reached Paris, the so-called Protectorate of Great Britain over Egypt was "recognized." The holding of Egypt by Great Britain is not a protectorate in the legal sense of the word, but under guise of a Protectorate, Great Britain is holding Egypt today as a subject and conquered nation.

The approval of this so-called protectorate would be accepted by the British Government as approval of the present holding of Egypt by Great Britain as spoils of war and would rivet the chains of subject-slavery upon the Egyptian people.

In a statement issued by the British Embassy at Washington, September 2, 1919, and which was published in the daily press, the Embassy stated:

“Great Britain has carefully avoided destroying the sovereignty of Egypt.”

A few days later the British foreign office in London gave an interview to the International News Service, claiming to have succeeded to Turkish nominal suzerainty over Egypt. Great Britain is claiming both a protectorate and a sovereignty over Egypt at the same time.

Great Britain is holding Egypt today not by right but by might of military force. Great Britain's seizure of Egypt is out of keeping with the world's new temper. Only by the exercise of the gospel of military force can the continued holding of Egypt by Great Britain be maintained. Only in violation of its sacred pledges and treaty obligations, can Great Britain assert dominion over the people of Egypt.

On November 10, 1914, Lloyd George in a speech called the world to witness the utter unselfishness of their part in the war. “As the Lord liveth,” he declared, “England does not want one yard of territory. We are in this war from motives of pure chivalry to guard the weak.” Shall Egypt be handed over to Great Britain in violation of the great principles for which Americans, Egyptians and the Allies fought? How can it be justly said that Egypt is outside the realm of the principles of the Fourteen Points and that Great Britain may deny the right of self-determination to Egypt?

The Egyptian people are liberty loving and peaceful. They have not interfered with other nations and they ask now that Great Britain not be allowed to destroy the inalienable right of the Egyptian people to liberty, and the right to have their own government, controlled by their own people.

BRITISH PLEDGES.

In May, 1882, a British fleet appeared before Alexandria. In June, 1882, a serious disturbance took place in Alexandria and a number of Europeans were killed. On July 11th and 12th, 1882, Alexandria was bombarded by the British fleet and British soldiers began to occupy Egypt. Great Britain pledged the Egyptian Government and the world that this occupation would be only temporary. The solemn pledge to this effect made by England are evidenced by the following documents:

1. Lord Granville's dispatch, November 4th, 1881: Egypt No. 1 (1882), pp. 2, 3, said:

“The policy of H. M.’s government toward Egypt has no other aim than the prosperity of the country, and its full enjoyment of that liberty which it has obtained under successive firmans of the Sultan. * * * It cannot be too clearly understood that England desires no partisan Ministry in Egypt. In the opinion of H. M.’s Government a partisan Ministry founded on the support of a foreign power, or upon the personal influence of a foreign diplomatic agent, is neither calculated to be of service to the country it administers, nor to that in whose interest it is supposed to be maintained.

2. In the Protocol signed by Lord Dufferin, together with the representatives of the five other great Powers, June 25th, 1882: Egypt No. 17 (1882), p. 33, it was provided:

“The Government represented by the undersigned engage themselves, in any arrangement which may be made in consequence of their con-

certed action for the regulation of the affairs of Egypt, *not to seek any territorial advantage*, nor any concession of any exclusive privilege, nor any commercial advantage for their subjects other than those which any other nation can equally obtain.” (Italics ours.)

3. Sir Beauchamp Seymour, in a communication to Khedive Tewfik, Alexandria, July 26th, 1882, published in the Official Journal of July 28, 1882, said:

“I, admiral commanding the British fleet, think it opportune to confirm without delay once more to your Highness that the Government of Great Britain has *no intention of making the conquest of Egypt*, nor of injuring in any way the religion and liberties of the Egyptians. *It has for its sole object to protect your Highness and the Egyptian people against rebels.*” (Italics ours.)

4. Sir Charles Dilke, in the House of Commons, July 25th, 1882, said:

“It is the desire of H. M.’s Government, after relieving Egypt from military tyranny, *to leave the people to manage their own affairs.* * * * We believe that it is better for the interests of their country, as well as for the interests of Egypt, that Egypt should be governed by liberal institutions rather than by a despotic rule. * * * We do not wish to impose on Egypt institutions of our own choice, but rather to leave the choice of Egypt, free, * * * It is the honorable duty of this country to be true to the principles of free institutions, which are our glory.” (Italics ours.)

5. The Rt. Honorable Mr. W. E. Gladstone, in the House of Commons, August 10th, 1882, said:

“I can go so far as to answer the honorable gentleman when he asks me whether we contemplate an indefinite occupation of Egypt. *Undoubtedly of all things in the world, that is a thing which we are not going to do.* It would be absolutely at variance with all the principles and views of H. M.’s Government, and *the pledges they have given to Europe and with the views, I may say, of Europe itself.*” (Italics ours.)

6. Lord Dufferin’s dispatch, December 19th, 1882: Egypt No. 2 (1883), p. 30, stated:

“In talking to the various persons who have made inquiries as to my views on the Egyptian question I have stated that we have not the *least intention of preserving the authority which has thus reverted to us.* * * * It was our intention so to conduct our relations with the Egyptian people that they should naturally regard us as their best friends and counselors, but that we did not propose upon that account arbitrarily to impose our views upon them or to hold them in an irritating tutelage.” (Italics ours.)

7. Lord Granville, December 29, 1882, Egypt No. 2 (1882), p. 33, officially stated:

“You should intimate to the Egyptian Government that *it is the desire of H. M.’s Government to withdraw the troops from Egypt as soon as circumstances permit,* that such withdrawal will probably be effected from time to time as the security of the country will allow it, and that H. M.’s Government hope that the time will be very short during which the full number of the present force will be maintained.” (Italics ours.)

8. Lord Dufferin’s dispatch, February 6, 1883, Egypt No. 6 (1883), pp. 41, 43, stated:

“The territory of the Khedive has been recognized as lying outside the sphere of European warfare and international jealousies. * * *

“The Valley of the Nile could not be administered from London. An attempt upon our part to engage in such an undertaking would at once render us objects of hatred and suspicion to its inhabitants. Cairo would become a focus of foreign intrigue and conspiracy against us, and we should soon find ourselves forced either to abandon our pretensions under discreditable conditions or embark upon the experiment of a complete acquisition of the country.”

9. Again, at page 83, Lord Dufferin said:

“Had I been commissioned to place affairs in Egypt on the footing of an Indian subject State the outlook would have been different. The masterful hand of a resident would have quickly bent everything to his will, and in the space of five years we should have greatly added to the material wealth and well-being of the country by the extension of its cultivated area and the consequent expansion of its revenue; by the partial if not the total abolition of the corvée and slavery; the establishment of justice and other beneficent reforms. But the Egyptians would have *justly* considered these advantages as dearly purchased at the *expense of their domestic independence*. Moreover, *H. M.’s Government have pronounced against such an alternative.*” (Italics ours.)

10. Mr. Gladstone in the House of Commons, August 6, 1883, said:

“The other powers of Europe * * * are well aware of the general intentions entertained by the British Government, intentions which may be subject, of course, to due consideration of that state of

circumstances, but conceived and held to be in the nature not only of information, *but a pledge or engagement.*" (Italics ours.)

11. Mr. Gladstone in the House of Commons, August 9, 1883, said:

"The uncertainty there may be in some portion of the public mind has reference to those desires which tend towards the *permanent* occupation of Egypt and its *incorporation in this Empire*. *This is a consummation to which we are resolutely opposed, and which we will have nothing to do with bringing about. We are against this doctrine of annexation; we are against everything that resembles or approaches it; and we are against all language that tends to bring about its expectation. We are against it on the ground of the interests of England; we are against it on the ground of our duty to Egypt; we are against it on the ground of the specific and solemn pledges given to the world in the most solemn manner and under the most critical circumstances, pledges which have earned for us the confidence of Europe at large during the course of difficult and delicate operations, and which, if one pledge can be more solemn and sacred than another, special sacredness in this case binds us to observe.* We are also sensible that occupation prolonged beyond a certain point may tend to annexation, and consequently it is our object to take the greatest care that the occupation does not gradually take a permanent character. * * * We cannot name a day, and do not undertake to name a day for our *final withdrawal*, but no effort shall be wanting on our part to bring about that withdrawal as early as possible. (Italics ours.)

12. Lord Granville's dispatch, June 16, 1884, Egypt No. 23 (1884), p. 13, stated:

“H. M.’s Government * * * are willing that the withdrawal of the troops shall take place at the beginning of the year 1888, provided that the Powers are then of opinion that such withdrawal can take place without risk to peace and order.”

13. Lord Derby in the House of Lords, February 26, 1885, said:

“From the first we have steadily kept in view the fact that our occupation *was temporary and provisional only*. * * * *We do not propose to keep Egypt permanently*. * * * *On that point we are pledged* to this country and to Europe; and if a contrary policy is adopted it will not be by us.” (Italics ours.)

14. Lord Salisbury in the House of Lords, June 10, 1887, said:

“It was not open to us to assume the protectorate of Egypt, because H. M.’s Government have *again and again pledged themselves that they would not do so*. * * * My noble friend has dwelt upon that pledge, and he does us no more than justice when he expresses his opinion that it is a *pledge* which has been constantly present to our minds. * * * It was undoubtedly the fact that our presence in Egypt, unrecognized by any convention * * * gave the subjects of the Sultan cause for a suspicion which we did not deserve.” (Italics Ours.)

15. Lord Salisbury in the House of Lords, August 12, 1889, said:

“When my noble friend * * * asks us to convert ourselves from guardians into proprietors

* * * * and to declare our stay in Egypt permanent * * * I must say I think my noble friend pays an insufficient regard to the *sanctity of the obligations which the Government of the Queen have undertaken and by which they are bound to abide*. In such a matter we have not to consider what is the most convenient or what is the more profitable course; we have to consider the course to which we are bound by our *own obligations and by European law*.” (Italics ours.)

16. Mr. Gladstone in the House of Commons, May 1, 1893, said:

“I cannot do otherwise than express my general concurrence * * * that the occupation of Egypt is in the nature of a burden and difficulty, and that the *permanent occupation of that country would not be agreeable to our traditional policy, and that* it would not be consistent with our good faith towards the Suzerain Power, while it would be contrary to the laws of Europe * * * I certainly shall not set up the doctrine that we have discovered a duty which enables us to set aside the *pledges* into which we have so freely entered * * * The thing we cannot do with perfect *honour* is either to deny that we are under engagements which preclude the idea of an *indefinite occupation*, or so to construe that indefinite occupation as to hamper the engagements that we are under by collateral considerations.” (Italics ours.)

17. The text of the Anglo-French Agreement of April 8, 1904, provides:

“The Government of His Majesty declares that it has no intention of altering the political status of Egypt.”

18. Lord Cromer's Report, March 3, 1907, Egypt No. 1 (1907), p. 2, stated:

"There are insuperable objections to the assumption of a British Protectorate over Egypt. It would involve a change in the political status of the country. Now, in Art. I of the Anglo-French Agreement of the 8th April, 1904, the British Government have explicitly declared that they have no intention of altering the political status of Egypt."

19. In an interview with Dr. Nimr, Editor of the "Mokattam," October 24, 1908, acknowledged as official by Sir E. Gray in the House of Commons, Sir Eldon Gorst said:

"It has been said that Great Britain proposes shortly to proclaim the protectorate or the annexation of Egypt to the British Empire. Will Sir Eldon Gorst permit me to ask him whether this rumor is well founded or not?"

Sir Eldon Gorst answered:

"*The rumor has no foundation and you may contradict it categorically.* Great Britain has engaged herself by official agreements with Turkey and the European Powers to respect the suzerainty of the Sultan in Egypt. She will keep her engagements, which, moreover, she reiterated in 1904 at the time of the conclusion of the Anglo-French Agreement. England stipulated in that Agreement that she has no intention to change the political situation in Egypt. Neither the people nor the Government wish to rid themselves of these engagements."

20. Sir Eldon Gorst's Report, March 27, 1909, Egypt No. 1 (1909), p. 1, stated:

"There exists among the better-educated sections of society a limited but gradually increasing class which interests itself in matters pertaining to the government and administration of the country. This class aspires quite rightly to help in bringing about the day when Egypt will be able to govern herself without outside assistance. This is also the end to which British policy is directed, and there need be no antagonism or principle between the Egyptian and English reforming elements."

21. In the same report, at page 48, Sir Eldon Gorst said:

"Since the commencement of the occupation the policy approved by the British Government has never varied, and its fundamental idea has been to prepare the Egyptians for self-government, while helping them in the meantime to enjoy the benefit of good government."

22. Sir Eldon Gorst's Report, March 26, 1910 Egypt No. 1 (1910), p. 51, stated:

"British policy in Egypt in no way differs from that followed by Great Britain all over the world towards countries under her influence, namely, to place before all else the welfare of their populations."

23. Sir Edward Grey, in the House of Commons, August, 1914, said:

"England stretches out her hand to any nation whose safety or independence may be threatened or compromised by any aggressor."

24. Former Premier Balfour, speaking for the Government at Guildhall on November 19, 1914, declared:

“We fight not for ourselves alone, but for civilization drawn to the cause of small states, the cause of all those countries which desire to develop their own civilization in their own way, following their own ideals without interference from any insolent and unauthorized aggressor.”

25. Premier Asquith, speaking at Guildhall, November 9, 1915, asserted:

“We shall not pause or falter until we have secured for the smaller states their charter of independence and for the world at large its final emancipation from the reign of force.”

26. And again Premier Asquith, on November 9, 1916, declared:

“This is a war among other things—perhaps I may say primarily—a war for the emancipation of the smaller states. * * * Peace when it comes, must be such as will build upon a sure and stable foundation the security of the weak, the liberties of Europe and a free future for the world.”

27. Premier Lloyd George, on June 29, 1917, said:

“In my judgment this war will come to an end when the Allied Powers have reached the aims which they set out to attain when they accepted the challenge thrown down by Germany to civilization.”

28. Asquith, in the House of Commons, on December 20, 1917, said:

“We ought to make it increasingly clear by every possible means that the only ends we are fighting for are liberty and justice for the whole world, through a confederation of great and small states, all to possess equal rights. A league of nations is the ideal for which we are fighting and we shall continue fighting for it with a clear conscience, clean hands and an unwavering heart.”

After the beginning of the World War and on December 18th, 1914, Great Britain proclaimed a so-called protectorate over Egypt. The proclamation seizing Egypt and placing Egypt under the British flag is published in the London Times of December 19, 1914, page 8, column 3. It reads:

“In view of the action of his Highness, Abbas Helmi Pasha, lately Khedive of Egypt, who has adhered to the King’s enemies, *His Majesty’s Government has seen fit to depose him from the Khedivate*, and that high dignity has been offered, with the title of Sultan of Egypt, to his Highness Prince Hussein Gamel Pasha, eldest living Prince of the family of Mehemet Ali, and has been accepted by him.

“The King has been pleased to approve the appointment of Prince Hussein to an honorary Knight Grand Cross of the Order of the Bath on the occasion of his accession to the Sultanate.” (Italics ours.)

The London Times, in the issue of December 19th, 1914, had large headlines saying, “Egypt Under the British Flag.” But the Times, in an editorial in the issue of same date, with characteristic British diplomacy, naively said:

“All that is desired now is to defend Egypt against attack and to keep the internal adminis-

tration running smoothly. Other questions can wait until peace is restored as Lord Cromer implies in the letter we published today. * * * It is purely a practical administrative step, dictated by the appearance of Turkey as a belligerent."

It will be noted that the seizure was sought to be justified only as a protection to Egypt against Turkish aggression. The truth is that under the guise of a "protectorate" Great Britain seized Egypt, and swept away every vestige of Egyptian freedom and independence. But the people of Egypt did not realize at that time the full meaning of this action on the part of Great Britain. They were told that it was a step toward the independence of Egypt. His Majesty, King George, in a letter to the Sultan whom he had appointed to rule over Egypt, which letter was widely circulated throughout Egypt, and was published in the London Times of date December 21st, 1914, said:

"* * * I feel convinced that you will be able, with the co-operation of your ministers and the protectorate of Great Britain, *to overcome all influences which are seeking to destroy the independence of Egypt*, * * *," (Italics ours.)

TREATMENT OF EGYPTIAN DELEGATES TO PEACE CONFERENCE.

Letter from the Chairman of the Egyptian Delegation to Sir Reginald Wingate, British High Commissioner to Egypt. From the Egyptian White Book, (page 19):

"I addressed to British headquarters on the 20th inst. (November), a letter in which I requested for my colleague and myself the permission necessary for voyage. * * * We have just

received a letter from the military authorities dated today, informing us that difficulties have arisen which have prevented them from responding before and that as soon as they are smoothed out we shall receive an answer. * * * We rely upon the traditions of Great Britain. The British have not ceased to give to the world examples of the devotion to the principles of individual liberty. Will not our request for passports receive a quick and favorable response?"

To this the following letter was received on December 1, 1918 (page 21):

"I am directed by His Excellency, the High Commissioner, to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 29th ult. and to inform you in reply that after reference to His Majesty's government, His Excellency feels unable to make any representations to the military authorities in the matter.

"I am to add that should you desire to submit suggestions as to the government of Egypt, not being inconsistent with the policy of His Majesty's government is already declared—such suggestions can most conveniently be submitted in writing to His Excellency. In this connection I may draw your attention to the communication addressed by Sir Mille Cheetham (Proclamation of Protectorate by the British government, December 18, 1914) by instruction of His Majesty's government to the late Sultan Hussein on the occasion of his accession."

To this the delegation replied on December 3, 1918, as follows (page 22):

"In response I allow myself to make known to your Excellency that it is not permitted, neither to me nor to any member of the delegation, to

make propositions which are not in accordance with the will of the Egyptian Nation as expressed in the Mandates that have been given us. * * * Forbidding our departure makes illusory and inoperative the mission that we have accepted by will of the people. It is difficult to conciliate this situation with the principles of liberty and justice which the victory of Great Britain and her Allies is supposed to have caused to triumph. This victory has repeatedly been declared to be for the purpose of opening a new era for mankind through listening and granting the just demands of peoples."

In a letter of protest to Premier Lloyd-George against the virtual imprisonment of the Egyptian delegation at Cairo, the President of the delegation wrote (page 26):

"You have certainly been misinformed of the circumstances that accompanied our sequestration. We cannot imagine how such proceedings can be justified, whether from the point of view of law, or social usage, or even of reasonable policy, and we cannot understand how the British can apply systematically so humiliating a treatment to a nation with the rich and glorious past of ours. Whatever may be its present weakness, a nation with a civilization so ancient will always preserve before the world its prestige and its title to the gratitude of the world.

"Deny the civilization of Egypt in spite of traces that attest its glorious past; deny its benefits to the culture of the world; suppose that it is only an agglomeration of savages ruled by the brutality of their instincts and without law—do you refuse to believe that Egypt has been a precious aid to you? The enormous sacrifice that we have made during the war in blood and treasure for the triumph of your cause, were indispen-

able to you, and moreover, you have recognized many times that these sacrifices were one of the principal factors of victory in the Orient.

“* * * Even were you to suppose that Egypt had no civilization and that Egypt gave you no aid, would you none the less refuse to apply to her the principles which you have agreed with President Wilson to apply—impartial justice on every side of settlement no matter whose interest is crossed, and not only impartial justice but also the satisfaction of several peoples whose fortunes are dealt with?”

Egyptian case stated as follows in a letter from Egyptian delegation to President of Peace Conference (page 88):

“For more than five months the British authorities refused to allow our delegation to leave for Europe. Public opinion, realizing that a Peace Conference had assembled and was taking up the problems of the Near East, and preparing a treaty to present to Germany, became aroused. The Egyptians insisted that the authorization for our departure be granted. Standing by the people, the cabinet presented its resignation, which was accepted. The answer of the British military authorities to the official request of the Egyptian Government was to order the arrest and deportation to Malta of the President of the delegation and of three of his colleagues. They were taken suddenly from their homes and hurried away under cover of night. There was no trial and they were not informed of the reasons for their arrest and deportation. When they learned of this act of violence, totally contrary to the law, there were peaceful demonstrations throughout the country, in which all classes took part. Government officials and the personnel of railways and other transportation service, decided to strike.

The English thus saw that in the entire territory of Egypt, the people of all classes, irrespective of religion, were against their domination, nevertheless, they persisted in their wish to govern by force of arms the people who did not want them.

"The manifestations were suppressed by machine guns which mowed down dozens of unfortunate demonstrators. Since the Egyptians had no arms, the order to fire was totally unwarranted. But frightfulness could not stop the Egyptians from proceeding in their determination to make an effort to obtain their independence. They had firm faith in the principles of President Wilson which had been solemnly accepted by the Entente Allies. They felt that if their delegation could only get to Paris that justice would be accorded to them. So, in spite of the death that awaited them, they advanced in groups in ecstasy, making the sacrifice of their lives to the cause of liberty.

"Even the women were not spared. Without mentioning those who fell on the field of honor during the national demonstrations, we can cite the case of the leading ladies of Cairo who organized under the leadership of the wife of the Prime Minister, a demonstration to protest to the diplomatic agencies against the murder of innocent and unarmed citizens in the streets of Cairo. Suddenly they were surrounded on all sides by soldiers who pointed their guns at them. This inspired one of the Egyptian women to say "Make of me if you will a second Miss Cavell." They were kept for more than two hours in the burning sun. In proof of this statement, we refer to the testimony of the agencies of the United States and Italy.

"The British authorities in Egypt were as much disturbed as provoked by the extent of the movement and astonished at their powerlessness to stop it. It was then that the spirit of vengeance got the better of them, and they then allowed themselves to indulge in the most disgrace-

ful excesses. No longer content to stop the demonstrations by means of rifles and machine guns, they were guilty in several places of rape, of assassination of peaceful villagers, of pillage, of arson—all with the most trifling pretext or even without pretext. No longer was it a question of individual abuses committed by stray soldiers such as those of which the Minister of Justice and the President of the Legislative Assembly had been victims—no longer was it a question of blows and thefts in the streets of Alexandria and Cairo, attacks began to be made by strong military attachments under the command of their officers in villages as well as cities.”

BRITISH VIEWS ON THE EGYPTIAN QUESTION.

Sir Thomas Barclay, Vice President of the Institute of International Law, says in his book, “New Methods of Adjusting International Disputes and The Future:”

“Turning to another aspect of international matters, it is deeply to be regretted that in several instances in our own time international treaties have not been regarded by public opinion with the same respect as international awards. The attitude of England towards Egypt, of Italy towards Turkey, of Russia towards Persia, of France towards Morocco, and especially of Germany towards Belgium, all are instances of eventual bad faith, however justifiable the original intervention may have been in the one case or unjustifiable in the other. They are additional evidence of the difficulty of preserving the peace of the world even by the most solemn of international undertakings.”

Excerpts from an article by the Right Hon. J. M. ROBERTSON, former member of the British Cabinet, in the *Contemporary Review* of May, 1919, under the title of "The Problem of Egypt," said in part:

"A rebellion in Egypt in 1919 has set all men elsewhere asking the question, Why? In 1914 a rebellion was planned for by the German enemy; how thoroughly, the world has not yet been informed. Had it broken out, the causation would have been sufficiently obvious, apart from any known native discontent. But that rebellion should have been averted then and should blaze forth now, when the leagued enemies of the British Empire are prostrate in defeat, signifies a new causation. What is it?

"Some have put the hypothesis that Egyptian Moslems are alarmed by the prospect of Jewish domination in Palestine. But even if there were not express testimony that the Zionist leaders have maintained thoroughly friendly relations with those of the Arabs, such an explanation would be plainly inadequate. Moslem feeling in Egypt about Palestine could at most aggravate other grounds of resentment; it could not motive a rebellion in which the Moslems of Palestine have no share. Such a rising, exhibiting no signs of direction from without, must be held to signify grievances within Egypt; and new and special grievances at that. The disorders reported from Cairo on April 14th appear to involve riots directed against the Armenians and Greeks; and it may be that the presence of a number of Armenian refugees has helped to foment fanaticism. But these attacks, as described, have the appearance of being a sequel to the previous insurrection rather than a key to its causation. Normally, the Moslems in Egypt live on perfectly good terms with the numerous Greeks; fanaticism being in fact not a

normal factor in the life of the Egyptian mass. And the remarkable statement made by Miss M. E. Durham, in the Daily News, of April 2nd would seem to yield the explanation. Thus it runs:

‘I was in Egypt from Nov., 1915, to April, 1916, and can confirm Dr. Haden Guest in his statement that it is to our own treatment of the Egyptians that we owe the present trouble. The authorities were certainly to blame in landing Colonial troops in Egypt without carefully instructing them as to the population they would meet there. So ignorant were numbers of these men that they imagined that Egypt was English, and the natives of the land were intruders.

‘More than one Australian said that he would clear the lot out if he had his way. They treated the natives with cruelty and contempt. In the canteen in which I worked, a very good native servant was kicked and knocked about simply because he did not understand an order given him by a soldier. An educated native in the town was struck in the mouth, and had his inlaid walking stick forcibly snatched from him by a soldier who wanted it. More than one English resident said to me: “It will take years to undo the harm that has been done here by the army.” Personally I felt that were I an Egyptian I should have spared no effort to evict the British. I felt ashamed of my country—bitterly ashamed. The opinion of the native for the soldier was amusingly illustrated by a small conversation book, one phrase of which was to the effect: “You fool. What for you spend all your money on beer?” and a dialogue with a beggar which ended: “I am poor; I am miserable;” to which the Briton replied: “Go to hell.”

‘I spoke with great severity frequently to the soldiers, telling them that by their conduct they were proving themselves the enemies of England;

that the Germans maltreated the enemy, but that they were attacking their own side and would make enemies. This surprised them very much. They were absolutely ignorant of the situation.

‘To make matters worse, for the first few days after the troops arrived in quantities, the drink shops were all open all day, and the unlovely results filled the natives with disgust and contempt. It was reported, I do not know with what truth, that drunken men had snatched the veils from Moslem women. The tale was believed by the natives.

‘Small wonder if they hate and dread us.’

“It is probably necessary to impress upon many people in this country that the insolent outrage such as that described, inflicted upon people in their own country by a dominant alien race, is about as maddening to the indigenous population as Englishmen found many of the tales of German brutality to British prisoners and subject Belgians during the war. The blood boils in Egypt perhaps more easily than in England. And if any of our people continue to argue, as many of them did a dozen or more years ago, that Egyptians ought to be too thankful for our beneficent rule to feel rebelliously about individual grievances, it will be more necessary than ever to point out that such reasoning tells only of an incurable moral blindness. Old chronicles are full of rebellion arising out of individual outrages; and a nation collectively grateful to an alien race for ruling it is not among the portents of history.

“How Government has gone in Egypt during the war it was practically impossible for us at home to know. It was no time for discussing reforms; and military rule had to prevail there at least as much as here. But when the world is intent upon a Peace Settlement which is to remedy as far as may be all the grievances

of subjected peoples, it would be idle to suppose that wild mutiny and stern repression (going to the length of bombing open villages) can go on in Egypt without comment or criticism from our Allies, to say nothing of our late enemies.

“If Egypt were under any rule but British, British critics in general would hold it a matter of course that such a mutiny as has recently been quelled there must signify some kind of misgovernment. The fact that we *can* quell a mutiny by bombing, from aeroplanes, the open villages of a population which simply cannot organize a military resistance, is no proof whatever either of the general badness of the Egyptian cause or the goodness of ours.

“Recollections of the history of Poland might suffice to move thinking men in this country to seek for a policy which shall not merely “hold down” the Egyptian people now but make it unnecessary to hold them down in future. Whatever the patriots in Parliament and the Northcliffe press may say for the moment, this bombing of open villages and flogging of rioters cannot improve our reputation either in Christendom or in the Moslem world; and it will not be permanently possible even for the patriots to keep up a denunciation of Germans for their past bombing of non-combatants here while we bomb non-combatants in Egypt. And there is a painful probability that such episodes will recur unless we make a new departure in Egyptian Government.

“It is presumably well known that the present system is one embodying a few of the forms without any of the realities of self-government. At every stage at which those forms have been adjusted, the obvious purpose was to give nothing approaching real power of any kind either to the mass of the people or to

Egyptian Ministers who nominally administered. For such a policy of emasculation the private defence has always been that neither Ministers nor people can be trusted, the former to govern or the latter to control them. It may simplify the discussion to admit that for this plea there is some justification. It would be hard to prove that the majority of the electors in Britain who polled at the last General Election are well qualified to vote. They are now showing signs of a change of feeling which could hardly be paralleled in Oriental history for quickness and completeness. That being so, it is not to be supposed that the people of Egypt are properly fitted to exercise political power. But that does not alter the fact that in Egypt as in Europe the only way in which any population can become fitted to exercise political power is to begin using some degree of political choice.

“Certainly it is important that some amount of education, in the ordinary sense of the term, should precede political enfranchisement—though a franchise long subsisted with a low standard of popular education in our own country. But Englishmen cannot long plead lack of education in Egypt as a ground for denying it any measure of real self-government, when it is by the decision of the British control that Egypt remains so largely uneducated. The policy of Lord Cromer in that regard was fatally transparent. Until within a short time of his resignation he refused even the appeal of his British (the controlling) Minister of Education to spend more than £200,000 a year on the schooling of a nation numbering some twelve millions. The finances of Egypt, he declared, did not admit of an expenditure much in excess of that. When criticism was brought to bear in the British Parliament, he quickly discovered that he could spend the

£400,000 his Minister had asked for; and since his day the expenditure has greatly increased, still without giving Egypt a good system of schools.

“The reforms, such as they are, have been largely the result of native pressure. Egyptians of all classes have long agitated for better and better schools, and in particular for a good modern University. Before the advent of the British control Egypt was, to a very considerable extent, in a state of educational progress. A study of the catalogue of the Khedival Library in 1906 revealed that quite a large number of scientific and other works had been translated into Arabic, chiefly from the French, in the days of Ismail and his predecessors. Yet when it was urged upon Lord Cromer’s Government that science teaching should be introduced into the programme of the secondary schools, the official answer was that books for the purpose did not exist. As they had existed a generation before, the irresistible conclusion was that the British control had let Egypt retrograde from the level reached under Moslem rule. So reactionary was the influence of the Cromer tradition that only after much pressure was it made possible for students of agriculture in Egypt to secure instruction in their own language. The Cromer tradition was that they must master either French or English for the purpose. Let the reader try to imagine what would be said of a British Government that refused to give instruction in scientific agriculture to farmer’s sons save in a foreign language.

“It is perfectly true that Lord Cromer managed Egyptian finances well and economically, in contrast with the extremely bad management of the old régime. Probably no native Government could have approached to the efficiency, to say nothing of the rectitude, of the

British control in finance. As to all that there is no dispute. But it savours almost of burlesque to argue that the duty of the British control towards Egypt was fulfilled when Egypt was made to pay full interest on all its debts and meet the whole costs, civil and military, of the British administration. For generations past, it has been an axiom in our politics that it is the business of governments to look to the moral welfare of the nation as well as to its finance, and it is upon their contributions to that welfare that political parties now mainly found their claims to support. The very backwardness of Egypt was a ground for special measures to promote her moral progress. To make the defence of British rule consist in having regulated her finances and increased her productivity while leaving her more backward than ever in the elements of qualification for self-government, was to discredit the cause that was defended. The obvious answer of every impartial foreigner to such a plea would be: 'You claim credit and gratitude for having secured the safe payment of your own bondholders, in whose interest you originally entered Egypt. Orderly government was essential to that. To earn credit and gratitude you must do a good deal more. You must raise the levels of life for the people of Egypt as you confessedly seek to raise them for your people at home. And you must know—what nation can know better?—that a people declared unfit to manage their own affairs are thereby pronounced low in the human scale.'

"It is, to say the least, unfortunate for the British Government that such an outbreak in Egypt should follow immediately on the close of the world war, when 'self-determination for subject races' passes for a principle with the Peace conference. Had those

responsible for the control of Egypt in the past sought to fulfil our old pledges with more of good will and good faith, we might have escaped this unpleasant emergency; though it will doubtless be argued that Lord Morley's progressive measures in India did not avert sedition there in 1914, and later. But the conclusion come to by responsible inquirers as regards India is obviously still more compulsive as regards Egypt. Our duty to prepare that country for self-government has been again and again officially avowed, from the time of our first entrance; and those who think we can forever go on simply repressing discontent and maintaining the *status quo*, are plainly unteachable by events. If the British control does not get newly into touch with intelligent native opinion, the situation will infallibly go from bad to worse, and this in the eyes of a world newly critical of 'imperialism.' That long vaunted ideal has somewhat rapidly become a term of censure for whole nations.

"We shall be faced, as a matter of course, with the regulation formula that there can be no talk of concessions to a people who have been recently in rebellion. The Russian bureaucracy used to talk in that fashion and we have seen the outcome. If those responsible for British rule in Egypt have in any degree learned the lesson, they will as soon as possible set about securing native support by taking natives into council; by giving room for real initiative to the nominal Egyptian Ministers, who must know a good deal more about Egypt than do more than a few of the British bureaucracy there, civil or military; and by giving some reality to the form of self-government which thus far have been allowed to count for next to nothing in Egyptian politics. Before the war, there were chronic and bitter complaints about the disre-

gard of native wishes, as expressed by the elected representatives, in regard to matters of administration nearly concerning Egyptian welfare. During the war, there, as here, must have been the possible minimum of consultation of the people. Perhaps what has happened in the English by-elections within the last month or two may suffice to suggest to the British Government that the sooner it resumes touch with public opinion everywhere the better it will be for national stability, to say nothing of the stability of the Ministry. Egyptian mutiny is only the non-constitutional version of the dissatisfaction that expresses itself in elections in the constitutional country. And, to put the case at its lowest, the safe course is to set about making Egypt constitutional.

“J. M. ROBERTSON.”

Capt. Wedgwood Benn in the House of Commons on May 15, initiated a debate on the state of affairs in Egypt. Among other things he said:

“It was not too much to say that the reason for the calmness in Egypt, even when the Turks were successful and had overrun the Sinai peninsula, was that the Egyptians trusted that the assistance they had rendered to the Empire in the war would not be permitted to interfere with the satisfaction of their legitimate aspirations. * * *

“The peace that had reigned in 1914, because there was trust, was converted by somebody in 1919, when there was disappointment, into a national insurrection. * * * The unrest among that large, busy and influential class of people was caused by the fact that changes were in the air and nobody had been consulted. The underlying cause was that the status of Egypt had been altered.

Mr. Spoor (Bishop Auckland) said in the House of Commons on the same day:

“The situation in Egypt appeared to have been aggravated enormously because Egypt was under military control, and military control of a very short-sighted kind. The methods of governing Egypt had become more and more military; and in regard to the censorship of information which was allowed to be sent from that country, it was interesting to note that the Times asserted ever since 1914, it had been the most inept and most savagely ruthless censorship in any country under British control.

“There were facts which could be thoroughly well authenticated of atrocities of the most extreme kind, that had been committed with the full sanction of our own military authorities.
* * * The allegation (of atrocities) had become so general, not only in this country but throughout Europe, that it was high time an inquiry was held.”

FRENCH VIEWS.

Speech of M. GOUDE, of the French Chamber of Deputies, at the Sitting of September 4, 1919. Translated from "*Le Journal Officiel*."

"M. Goude: In his speech of yesterday, M. Franklin-Bouillon said that under the appearance of 'no compromise' M. Clemenceau had surrendered on every point.

"I will try to show that the President of the Council (Prime Minister) at any rate adopted these tactics when it came to settling a question that he understands thoroughly, a question often discussed from this tribune and upon which the Prime Minister has often spoken.

"Article 147 of the Treaty submitted to us for ratification says:

'Germany declares that she recognizes the protectorate proclaimed over Egypt by Great Britain on the 18th of December, 1914.'

"This means that Egypt is placed under the Protectorate of England without this agreement having ever been ratified by Parliament. Neither in the Treaty of Peace nor in the report of M. Maurice Long has one dared to directly approach this question; it is well known that it is a thorny one and that it is absolutely contrary to all the principles laid down by the Entente Governments during the course of the war.

"It is known that at the present moment—in spite of their appeals to all the Parliaments and all the politicians of the Entente—a people are being placed under

the domination of another people. This is being done in an underhand way. We are not asked at first—we, the French Chamber, to ratify an agreement recognizing the protectorate declared by England over Egypt in 1914, but we are told: ‘We are compelling Germany to recognize the protectorate proclaimed by England over Egypt.’

“The question is brought up, I repeat, in an underhand way, because it is known that if the sole question of the English protectorate in Egypt was brought before Parliament, a great debate would spring up and I am convinced that if this question was the only one under discussion before you, such a project of the Treaty would never be approved. I, therefore, wish to know and I ask for what reasons the French Government thinks it right to place under English domination the Egyptian people who protest with all their might and all their energy as I will show.

“Is it not well known that Egypt has always shown its determination to be independent? Is it not well known that it is worthy of this independence?

“The Prime Minister himself has vigorously defended the dignity of Egypt. He knows as we do that the production of Egypt supports its 16 millions of inhabitants, including Egyptians and Soudanese; that almost all the landed property belongs to Egyptians; that its farms are cultivated by native born subjects to the exclusion of all others; that this country had in 1913 a foreign commerce amounting in value to 12 thousand million francs (about 2,400,000,000 dollars); that the National budget of Egypt is 800,000,000 francs (about 160,000,000 dollars); that intellectual Egyptians cultivate French traditions; that there exists in this country boy’s and girl’s colleges in large num-

bers as well as different high schools where the French language is exclusively employed without forgetting the celebrated Law school.

“Fifty years ago the Khedive could declare:

‘My country is no longer in Africa. It is a part of Europe.’

“Thirty years or so ago, the Prime Minister, rising in this Tribune to defend Egyptian independence as I defend it today declared:

‘I do not desire to enter into ethnographic consideration as regard the Egyptian race—this is not the place for it—but it is certain that this race, of which we see some remarkable specimens amongst us, in our schools, is a calm and docile race—too docile, it may be said at certain moments—susceptible of culture and application—an industrious race of which surely one has every reason to expect much. No one can stand up in this Tribune, no one will come into this Parliament of the Republic to say that these men are incapable of freeing themselves and that we owe no other duty to them, except to govern them with a courbash and a cudgel.’

(‘Hear, Hear’ at the extreme left).

“Thirty-two years ago the Prime Minister made these declarations. Since then, as we know, European civilization has been spreading itself more and more in Egypt, which ardently desires to Europeanize its civilization, which is modifying its political structure, which has extended the suffrage to all citizens, who have attained their twentieth year—a reform that certain European nations might well envy.

“It must be remembered that at the moment of the declaration of war, on the 2nd of August, 1914, Egypt was independent under the sole suzerainty of the Sultan of Turkey. This suzerainty, approved in 1840 by the European Powers, consisted in the payment each year by Egypt of a tribute of 15 million francs to the Sultan—and that was all! Having done this, it had an absolute right recognized by the European powers, to manage its own affairs according to its fancy and to have its own constitution. I know well that little by little England, by the force of her armies, had got hold of Egyptian institutions, that the Members of the Government were hardly anything more than English officials and that the President of the Legislative Assembly is appointed by the Government. But this was putting into practice the formula against which we are all struggling: ‘*Might is right.*’ England had no precise and express right in Egypt. The most famous English politicians—the heads of the Government—have said so on several occasions, as, for instance, Gladstone, who in the House of Commons as far back as the 23d of June, 1884, stated:

‘We pledge ourselves not to prolong our military occupation in Egypt beyond the 1st of January, 1888.’

“It is the same Prime Minister who said on the 18th September, 1885:

‘England ought to withdraw from Egypt as soon as British honour will permit of it. We will never admit that there can be any question of annexation, of a protectorate or even of an indefinite prolongation of the English occupation and we repudiate all idea of any compensation

whatsoever for the efforts and sacrifices that we have made up to this day. English policy is founded on an error and what is best to be done in a matter like this, is promptly to put an end to such an intervention.'

"It is Lord Salisbury who said on the 10th June, 1887 in the House of Lords:

'Her Majesty's Government by virtue of its previous engagements and of the rules of international law does not think that it can place Egypt under a protectorate. Its rule should be limited to coming to an understanding with the Porte to defend the interests of the Khedive against political calamities and to maintain the *Statu quo* in the valley of the Nile.'

"There has been a large number of the declarations but to shorten matters, I will only quote the one made by Lord Salisbury in the House of Lords on the 12th August, 1889:

'We cannot proclaim our protectorate over Egypt nor our intention to occupy it effectively and perpetually; this would amount to breaking the international pledges signed by England.'

"Such was the state of the question during the occupation. In the agreement called the 'entente cordiale' concluded in 1904 between France and England, article 1, begins as follows:

'The Government of His Britannic Majesty declares that it has not the intention to change the political state of Egypt.'

“In the course of the discussion of the Fashoda affair, when England asked me to withdraw it was not because the Soudan belonged or could belong to England—it was because of England’s declaration that it was Egyptian territory. England has then clearly recognized on every occasion the independence of Egypt.

“Has the country, which was independent under the sole suzerainty of the Sultan, and under the conditions that I have precisely indicated become less deserving of our consideration during the War? Is there any reason for modifying, by lowering it, the political status of Egypt?

“You know that Egypt came at once and took her stand with the Allies. It must not be forgotten that the silver thread to which I referred a moment ago still bound it to Turkey.

“Before Turkey declared war, Egypt placed itself at the disposal of England—of the English Consul General—by saying:

‘If you will promise us our complete independence, if the English armies undertake to quit our country after the war, we will place our financial resources, our provisions, our arms and our sons, all in fact that we possess at your entire disposal; we are ready to go with you to the Continent to defend the interests of the Allies.’

“To the offer thus made at this moment, England replied by a downright refusal.

“Later the situation got worse. Turkey who was suzerain over Egypt went to war against the Allies. Egypt renewed its offer in the same way. The Sultan, be it noted, had proclaimed a Holy War. Do not forget that Egypt is a musulman country, but a country

of semi-European civilization where a very lively sympathy for Europe exists. In spite of the powerful effect that the proclamation of the Holy War might have on the peasant masses, who are profoundly musulman in sentiment, Egypt, attracted by European culture came to us and said once more: 'Insure us our independence after the war and we are with you body and soul.'

"We have made use of Egypt; it is the Egyptian artillery which checked the impetus of the German-Turkish armies in February, 1915 when these armies tried to seize the Suez Canal and to cut our communications. Egypt put its cotton at the disposal of Europe. Later on in face of the necessity of growing wheat, it abandoned the profitable production of cotton in order to cultivate wheat and it put all its provisions at the disposal of the Army of Salonica which it victualled to a great extent.

"With a population of 13 millions of inhabitants, it has placed 1,200,000 workers at the disposal of the Entente—a figure recognized as exact by the English.

"All this Egypt has done for the Entente. Have we now the right as a recompense for these services, to violate the very principles that everyone here invokes, the principles which have been laid down with precision by President Wilson, when for instance he said: 'Peoples ought not be passed on from one Sovereignty to another by an International Conference or an arrangement between rivals and adversaries (Hear, Hear from several benches of the extreme left).' The national aspirations ought to be respected. The peoples ought today be governed by their own consent.

“Is it not there, besides an international interest that Egypt shall not be placed under the domination of a European Power? I have here under my eyes a short extract from a speech of M. de Freycinet, then Prime Minister, who on the 27th November, 1886, summed up admirably the Egyptian question by saying:

‘Egypt is a sort of crossing for the old world. It is a junction between Europe, Asia and Africa. It is a highway which permits of the penetration of the Far East possessions. Besides, he who is master of Egypt is master to a great extent of the Mediterranean. It is certain that if a Great Power installed itself definitely in Egypt, this would be a very heavy blow to French influence in the Mediterranean in such a manner that in my estimation, France ought never reconcile herself to the idea that Egypt could definitely fall into the hands of a European Power.’ (‘Hear, hear’ from the extreme left).

“This is an undoubted fact. And the question ought not to be examined merely from a material standpoint but also from a moral point of view. This musulman country into which European civilization penetrates little by little is being driven by us into a corner where violence is its only recourse. This is henceforth its only political issue. We could however have made of Egypt a point of contact between Eastern and Western civilization (‘Hear, Hear’ from the extreme left). This is exactly what we are *not* doing.

“Not only will this country which came of its own accord to the Entente receive no compensation but by virtue of the Treaty of Peace its bounds will be tightened and its chains made heavier.

“ * * * in this Chamber, which during such a long time and so very justly complained of the Bis-

marekian policy, which had left in the side of France the painful scar of Alsace-Lorraine, it is my desire to declare that it is helping to create at this moment another Alsace-Lorraine.

‘M. Jean Longuet: Ten Alsace-Lorraines.

‘M. Goude: Certainly, many Alsace-Lorraines, but this one is particularly characteristic. * * *

“Egypt which during the whole of the war and in order to insure the victory of the Allies, has endured without complaining the yoke of English militarism, which has borne with all the measures of censure, with all the house searches, trial sentences, etc.

‘M. Jean Longuet: With the atrocities!

‘M. Goude: Atrocities,—yes, that is the word. Egypt will have no more of that now. It is in full open revolt. You are aware that the President of the Egyptian Council (Egyptian Prime Minister) who, however, is a nominee of the English, and in a certain sense an English official, found the Egyptian people so unanimous against this domination and the protectorate, that he resigned. You know that the officials who are specially under English authority, seeing that their written protests were distorted went out on a general strike in order to emphasize their vote of independence. You are aware that the working men are on strike—that revolts have taken place in the streets in which all classes and creeds have been united by a common determination to win independence, that crowds have been fired upon, that there have been massacres and that condemnations have been pronounced.’

“Here, we have a University Professor—a Fellow—condemned to penal servitude for life for having made a speech—in favor of independence. Here again—

to mention one case amongst many others—we have Ibrahim Chalami sent to the gallows for having cried out at the head of a demonstration ‘Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.’

‘M. Barthe: They condemn even those who cry “Long live France.”’

‘M. Goude: There are thousands of examples of this kind. To maintain its protectorate, England has at present 150,000 soldiers; she is obliged to keep soldiers in every village because amongst University men, notables, commercial men, fellaheen, no one will accept this domination at any price and everyone demands independence. Thrilling appeals have been addressed to President Wilson, M. Clemenceau, to the Chairman of our Peace Commission, to the Italian, American, and English Parliaments.’

‘M. Jean Longuet: They are all deaf.

‘M. Goude: But at all times and everywhere everybody remains deaf except however the American Senate, the Commission of which has proclaimed that Egypt ought to be as independent of English diplomacy as of Turkish diplomacy and that it must be left master of its own destinies.’

(“Monsieur le President of the Council”— said the orator addressing M. Clemenceau) “not only have you abandoned Egypt that you know personally, since, I repeat to you, you have spoken very hard words against our friends, the English, from this very Tribune when this question was under discussion but, what is graver still—what seems to me monstrous, is that a Peace Conference brought together to settle the question of the entire world has upon the orders of the English Government refused to hear the Egyptian Delegation, composed, as you well know, of the President of the Chamber of Deputies of that Country,

of Members of Parliament, of representatives of the intellectual classes and of Egyptian notables. And by refusing to hear them you have precipitated Egypt into the only path left open to it; the path of violence!

"I ask you, M. the President of the Council, how can Egypt otherwise get out of the situation in which you have placed it? Yes—by your attitude and your decisions you have decreed for that country violence and revolution.

"You said of Egypt that its inhabitants were pacific and docile—too docile perhaps. A heap of iniquities have indeed been necessary to provoke the revolt of such a peaceable race.

"How is it possible to better such a situation? Is there any means of doing so? To whom should the Egyptian National Representatives apply? They already have tried all the means at their disposal.

"The Vice-President of the Chamber of Deputies and several of his colleagues have been imprisoned simply because they wanted to come to Europe to be heard by a delegation of the Peace Conference. And never at any single moment has this Conference been willing to listen to them.

"More than that, the Egyptian Army has been utilized during the war to occupy Hedjaz. The Egyptian armies have been equally employed to occupy Soudan and put a stop to the German maneuvers. Today at the Conference of the Peace, the King of Hedjaz is received—a king entirely of English manufacture created in order that England might have an additional vote. And this king, who has just come into existence, who represents a country inhabited exclusively by nomadic tribes—this king has been given the right to sign a treaty in which a Protectorate has been imposed on the neighboring Egyptian people.

“To this point, have you gone in your injustices towards Egypt, and yet, M. le President of the Council, when you delivered the speech that I have recalled—on the question of Egypt and the Anglo-French relations you concluded by saying ‘Assuredly if the end of the Anglo-French alliance such as it has been depicted to us and such as it would be applied in practice was to organize with our aid the Slavery of the Egyptian people and to reduce them to the position of an inferior race, I would repudiate it with the greatest energy and I would say to our pretended allies—to our accomplices, I should call them—that I refund my share of responsibility in such a reprehensible undertaking.’

“Thirty years ago you expressed yourself in this manner. Since then Egypt has progressed; it has come closer and closer to European civilization. And you want today to make us share the responsibility for the crime committed against Egypt in the Peace Treaty. For my part, I will not lend myself to it. Besides, I am certain that the English people repudiating English bourgeois traditions (applause on some benches of the extreme left) and united with the French people, will soon redress the injustice and the crime that you are committing by once more enslaving Egypt (Applause at extreme left).”

AMERICAN VIEWS.

President Wilson, in his great address at Mt. Vernon, the home of Washington, on July 4, 1918, said:

“There can be but one issue. The settlement must be final. There can be no compromise. No half-way decision would be tolerable. No half-way decision is conceivable. These are the ends for which the associated peoples of the world are fighting, and which must be conceded them before there can be peace. * * * The settlement of every question, *whether of territory, or sovereignty, or economic arrangement, or of political relationship upon the basis of the free acceptance of that settlement by the people immediately concerned and not upon the basis of the material interest or advantage of any other nation or people which may desire a different settlement for the sake of its own influence or mastery.* * * * What we seek is the reign of law based upon the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind.” (Italics ours.)

Shall Egypt, without the consent of the Egyptians, be turned over to England for the sake of England's influence or mastery?

In the 14 points advanced by President Wilson, we find the following pertinent and applicable provisions:

“Point 14. A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of *political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.*” (Italics ours.)

This principle applied to Egypt would lead to a conclusion directly opposite to the endorsement of

the British seizure of Egypt and destruction of Egypt's independence.

Applying the principle of the Seventh Point to Egypt and only substituting the word "Egypt" for "Belgium," the Seventh Point would read:

"Egypt, the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored, without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all other free nations. No other single act will serve as this will serve to restore confidence among the nations in the laws which they have themselves set and determined for the government of their relations with one another. Without this healing act the *whole structure and validity of international law is forever impaired.* (Italics ours.)

The Question of Egypt.

From the *Washington Post*, Thursday, October 16, 1919.

"The question of Egypt's status is brought to the front by Senator Owen's proposed reservation to the peace treaty. The fact that this reservation is offered by a Democrat, a strong supporter of the President, increases the weight of the objections which are finding voice in the United States against the snuffing out of the principle of self-determination of well defined nationalities. President Wilson gained the support of liberty-loving men throughout the world when he set forth that principle and announced that it would be made effective at Paris. In so far as the conference adhered to this principle its work was good and

permanent, and wherever the principle was violated there have been disorders and threats of war.

“Senator Owen’s proposed reservation provides that the British protectorate over Egypt shall be recognized as merely a means through which the nominal suzerainty of Turkey over Egypt shall be transferred to the Egyptian people, and shall not be construed to mean recognition by the United States of British sovereignty over the Egyptian people.

“The story of British ascendancy over Egypt, now apparently to culminate in the extinction of self-government, is comparatively brief. The first occupation by British troops was in 1882 and the ostensible object was to suppress a rebellion against the Khedive. The occupation was to be only temporary, according to Premier Gladstone. He declared that England had given ‘specific and solemn pledges to the world’ that it would not annex Egypt, and he added that these pledges had earned for England the confidence of Europe. Evidently there was no intention at that time to absorb Egypt. Yet the troops were not withdrawn, and have never been withdrawn, notwithstanding the persistent efforts of the Egyptian people to recover the practical independence they had enjoyed.

“After the world war began the British government removed the Khedive and appointed another, as a war measure, and announced that Egypt was placed under a British protectorate. The Egyptian people might have been alarmed by this had not King George himself sent a letter to the Egyptians, telling them that the change was but a step toward the complete independence of the people, and that the protectorate would endure only during the war period. This reassurance was satisfactory, and the Egyptians joined the allies heartily, furnishing troops and large numbers of lab-

orders who built the railroads, pipe lines, and other military works in Palestine and elsewhere.

“When the armistice was signed the Egyptians believed the day of their national independence to be at hand. They sent a commission to Paris to attend the peace conference and to arrange for recognition of the independence of Egypt. But the leaders of this commission were seized by British officers and deported to Malta, where they were placed in a German prison camp.

“From that hour there has been a smoldering volcano of revolt in Egypt. The people have had several serious clashes with British soldiers in which machine guns have quelled popular uprisings. In the meantime Great Britain has obtained from President Wilson a conditional recognition of the protectorate over Egypt, and in the peace treaty is a clause requiring Germany to recognize the protectorate.

“The intentions of Great Britain toward Egypt are somewhat confused in the minds of other governments on account of conflicting statements issued by British authority. When the Egyptian question was before the Senate committee on foreign relations on September 2, the British embassy here made public a statement declaring that ‘the British government has carefully avoided destroying Egyptian sovereignty,’ and that the British flag in Egypt covered only British military establishments. But the British foreign office a few days later announced that Great Britain had succeeded to the sovereignty of Turkey over Egypt and had acquired Egypt as spoils of war, apparently discarding the pledge of King George and developing a new policy of permanent control over Egypt.

“It may be that unfortunately worded or unauthorized statements by British officials are at the bottom

of the public confusion. In that case a clear reaffirmation of Britain's intention to relinquish the protectorate and restore Egypt to its people as soon as the peace treaty is ratified would remove all apprehension. In the meantime, taking the treaty as it finds it, the Senate will doubtless adopt a reservation on the lines suggested by Senator Owen, for it is quite evident that the United States cannot consistently subscribe to a general principle of self-determination and independence of nations and yet concur in the involuntary absorption of Egypt by Great Britain."

Egyptian Betrayal the Most Heinous of the Reactionist Wrongs.

By GEORGE H. SHIPLEY.

"The case of the people of Egypt is a betrayal the most heinous of the reactionist wrongs.

"On December 21, 1914, five months after the opening of the war, the British Liberal Government after deposing the Egyptian Khedive and placing in office a sultan of their own choosing, spoke as follows to the people of Egypt in the name of the King of England:

"I feel convinced that you [the new Sultan] will be able, with the cooperation of your ministers and the protectorate of Great Britain, TO OVERCOME ALL INFLUENCES WHICH ARE SEEKING TO DESTROY THE INDEPENDENCE OF EGYPT * * *. (London Times.)

"And yet the so-called Peace Conference of the Allied Coalition Governments, *has actually refused to*

the 13,000,000 Egyptians their independence under the protection of the League of Nations, and the British Reactionist Government has shot down hundreds of the Egyptians who had the manhood to assert their lawfully established rights, won in part of the lives and the sacrifices of we Americans!

EGYPT'S SOVEREIGNTY VIOLATED.

By HERBERT ADAMS GIBBONS, Sometime Fellow of Princeton University;
 Author of the "New Map of Europe;" the "New Map
 of Asia;" the "New Map of Africa," etc.

"The 'interpretative resolutions' presented by Senator Owen in the Senate on Tuesday, greatly encourage liberal thinkers, who are dissatisfied with the treaty at Versailles, not for party or internal, but for international reasons. Senator Owens is a Democrat and a loyal supporter of the Administration. He makes it clear that he intends to vote for ratifying the treaty without amendment or reservation. But he feels that the Senate while unqualifiedly accepting the document from a technical point of view, should not fail to let the world know how the United States stands in regard to many of its provisions.

"Senator Owen wants the United States to start to work immediately for a change in the league covenant that will give freedom to subject states capable of self-government. Senator Owen mentions specifically a great wrong done to a sovereign State by the treaty of Versailles.

'That the protectorate which Germany recognizes in Great Britain over Egypt,' reads the Owen

resolution, 'is understood to be merely a means through which the nominal suzerainty of Turkey over Egypt shall be transformed to the Egyptian people and shall not be construed as a recognition by the United States in Great Britain of any sovereign rights over the Egyptian people or as depriving the people of Egypt of any right of self-government.'

"This resolution is apt to displease British public opinion, and Senator Owen may be accused of indulging in the old sport of twisting the lion's tail. But the accusation is unfounded. If we allowed our natural sentiments of affection for our kinsmen overseas to keep us silent at this time, we should find them getting away with a lot of booty—and ourselves unconsciously or unthinkingly giving sanction to high-handed and unjustified acts of oppression and international robbery. We cannot be too strong in our condemnation for instance, of the Anglo-Persian treaty, concluded secretly by intimidation and bribery at the very moment we are asked to give our cooperation to a Society of Nations, which Persia is invited to join.

"The case of Egypt stands out with remarkable clearness. It is one of the few moot questions of the Treaty of Versailles which has not two sides. The British protectorate over Egypt is an illegal action, not only violating the sovereignty of Egypt, but also the promises officially made by generations of British statesmen. No denial of this fact is possible. Open any history or go to British official correspondence published by the British Foreign Office, and you will read the repeated assurances given to the Egyptians and to the other Powers that Great Britain did not intend to stay in Egypt and would not establish a protectorate over Egypt.

“The excuse for not hearing the representatives of Egypt at the Peace Conference was that the question of Egypt did not come within the scope of the conference. If this were valid, why did the Treaty of Versailles mention Egypt? And what right had the Powers to deal with Egyptian questions at all? But Egypt did enter within the scope of the conference, because it was a country whose status had been changed by the war and during the war. Technically, as well as morally, the Egyptians had as much right to participation in the conference as the Arabs of the Hedjaz, and more right to independence. For Egypt was only nominally under the suzerainty of Turkey. By her declaration of war against Turkey, the bond of vassalage was broken. *Ipso facto*, Egypt was independent.

“But the British, who were occupying the country, proclaimed—without taking into their confidence the Egyptian Legislative Assembly or asking the consent of the Egyptian people—their protectorate over Egypt. In war, what is expedient is justifiable. Although formally protesting against this violation of pledges given and reiterated, the Egyptians cooperated loyally with the British throughout the war, waiting for the Peace Conference to decide upon the legality of British action. The Prime Minister, who consented to serve the new regime and who continued in office throughout the war, told me when I was in Cairo in 1916 that he was simply waiting until the end of the war to hold the British to their promises. After the armistice, Rushdi Pasha asked to be allowed to go to London to take up the matter of the status of Egypt with the British. Permission was refused. A rigorous censorship was maintained. The Egyptians were held prisoners in their own country.

“Rushdi Pasha and the entire Cabinet resigned. A period of military dictatorship began. When the elected representatives of the Egyptian people asked for passports to proceed to Paris, the British suddenly arrested without warrant or warning the president of the delegation and three of its leaders and deported them to Malta. This led to the insurrection put down by machine guns and burning of villages. The British used the means of suppressing what they called ‘rebellion’ which the world roundly condemned the Germans for in Belgium. Finally, force of Egyptian public opinion compelled the release of the delegates and the granting of passports for Paris. But the Egyptian delegation, after its arrival in Paris, was never heard by the conference. The stipulation compelling Germany to recognize the British protectorate was inserted in the Treaty of Versailles in defiance of the basic principle President Wilson had declared would be followed in making peace. A whole nation was robbed of its sovereignty and its international status changed against its will and, without having been heard, Egypt was Shantung over again.

“I would not have my readers think that I am writing without knowledge of the facts. A White Book has just been published by the Egyptian delegation, which contains documents setting forth the history of the past year. The British Foreign Office does not deny the authenticity of these documents. As for the men deported to Malta, I know them personally. No foreigner, even a Britisher, who knows Egypt can deny that these men are honorable and capable and that they represent the Egyptian people. The president of the delegation, Zagloul Pasha, is one of the best loved men in Egypt, a veritable father of his people, Mohammed Mahmoud Pasha, a graduate of Oxford,

was formerly Governor of the Suez Canal. The other members of the delegation include the Sheik of the Arabs of the Fayoum, the foremost landowners and lawyers in Egypt, and the librarian of the National Library. They are the cream of the Christian element and the Greek Orthodox and Catholic element, as well as the Mohammedan element. The Egyptians are united, irrespective of creed, in their determination not to be bartered from one sovereignty to another like cattle. * * *

THE WIND AND THE WHIRLWIND

BY

WILFRED BLUNT.

Published in 1883

From which the following may be quoted:

I have a thing to say. But how to say it?
I have a cause to plead. But to what ears?
How shall I move a world by lamentation,
A world which heeded not a Nation's tears?

* * *

Where shall I find a hearing? In high places?
The voice of havoc drowns the voice of good.
On the throne's steps? The elders of the Nation
Rise in their ranks and call aloud for blood.

* * *

We have had enough of strangers and of princes
Nursed on our knees and lords within our house.
The bread which they have eaten was our children's.
For them the feasting and the shame for us.

* * *

Alas for liberty, alas for Egypt!
What chance was yours in this ignoble strife?
Scorned and betrayed, dishonored and rejected,
What was there left you but to fight for life?

* * *

Sad Egypt! Since that night of misadventure
Which slew your first-born for your Pharaoh's crime
No plague like this has God decreed against you,
No punishment of all fore-doomed in Time.

* * *

And thou too, Egypt, mourner of Nations,
Though thou hast died to-day in all men's sight,
And though upon thy cross with thieves thou hangst,
Yet shall thy wrong be justified in right.

* * *

Thou shall not be forsaken in thy children.
Thy righteous blood shall fructify the earth.
The virtuous of all lands shall be thy kindred,
And death shall be to thee a better birth.

Therefore I do not grieve. Oh hear me, Egypt!
Even in death thou art not wholly dead.
And hear me England! Nay, thou needs must hear me.
I had a thing to say. And it is said.



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 020 914 653 8

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 020 914 653 8